

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration given the present application. Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-23 and 25-27 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 19-21 have been amended and claims 26 and 27 have been added through this Reply. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 19-21 are independent. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seeks timely allowance of all pending claims.

Amendment

The amendments made to the claims do not add any new matter to the application and do not raise any new issues.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,883,621 to Iwamura in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0203435 to Karlquist et al. (Karlquist) further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0063589 to Haines et al. (Haines). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action acknowledges that Iwamura in view of Karlquist does not disclose that the display mapping displays the device images according to the degree of the reception for each device; however, the Office Action alleges that Haines cures the deficiencies of Iwamura in view of Karlquist.

Haines discloses a wireless network 100 that includes one or more wireless gateways 110 and one or more other network devices 120. The network devices 120 communicate with one more of the gateways 110 using wireless communications. *See Figure 1 and paragraph [0018] of Haines.* Arcs are presented as portions of closed curves associated with the wireless gateways. The network device is expected to be located at the intersection of the arcs. *See Figure 2.* Each wireless network device in communication with a wireless gateway may be

located relative to one another by repeating the process of locating wireless network devices by building a database, table or some other data structure. The knowledge of an absolute location of the devices permit mapping of the wireless network by cartesian coordinates, latitude/longitude or other coordinate system. *See paragraphs [0040] and [0041]*. The images are used to represent the location of the network device but do not provide any information related to magnitude of reception.

In particular, according to the present specification,

“Here, the form is, for example, the shape, size, or color of the image. Further, the form according to the state of communication is, for example, such that, when the state of communication is in a good condition, the outline of the image is sharpened, the size of the image is enlarged, or the color of the image is deepened. On the other hand, when the state of communication is in a bad condition, the outline of the image is gradated, the size of the image is reduced, or the color of the image is made faint. Therefore, with the structure, the user can sensibly comprehend an estimated distance between the display device and each of the transmission devices, with a result that the user can promptly find a desired transmission device.”

The applied references do not disclose, for example, a feature that outline of images corresponds to the state of communication, i.e., magnitude of the degree of reception.

For at least these reasons, the applied references, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest that “at least one of outline, size, and color of the images corresponds to magnitude of the degree of reception” as recited in independent claims 1 and 19 or that “at least one of outline, size, and color of the images corresponds to the magnitude of the degree of communication” as recited in independent claims 3 and 20 and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 21.

Thus, the applied references fail to teach each and every claimed feature of independent claims 1, 3, 10 and 19-21. The dependent claims are at least allowable by virtue of their dependence on corresponding allowable independent claims 1, 3, 10 and 19-21.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims based on the applied references is respectfully requested.

New Claims 26 and 27 are Patentable

New claims 26 and 27 are added. New claims 26 and 27 are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant